

*Statement Of The Substance Of The Interview*

On June 11, 2008, Thomas Lees on behalf of the applicants conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Phillips. Thanks to the Examiner once again, for the time and consideration during the telephone interview. No demonstrations were utilized. Additionally, no exhibits were used during the interview with the Examiner. An unofficial proposed claim amendment was transmitted along with the request for interview, which was submitted to the Examiner prior to the June 11, 2008 interview date.

During the interview, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and the unofficial proposed amendment to claim 1 were discussed in general terms. Moreover, the disclosure of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0129127 to Romero et al. (hereinafter, '*Romero*') and U.S. Pat. No. 7,197,547 to Miller et al. (hereinafter, '*Miller*'), were discussed with reference to the unofficial proposed claim amendment. The thrust of the Examiner's arguments was analogous to those set out in the Office action dated April 8, 2008.

The thrust of the applicants' arguments was that even when *Romero* and *Miller* are combined, the references fail to teach or suggest at least individually polling each of the plurality of servers by the load balancer so as to obtain a configuration file from each polled server if available, wherein each obtained configuration file contains the parameters necessary to configure the load balancer for bringing the associated polled server on-line. Moreover, even when *Romero* and *Miller* are combined, the references fail to teach or suggest at least that each corresponding configuration file is stored in a local memory of its associated server at a location identified by a predefined Uniform Resource Locator (URL), as recited in claim 1, as amended herein. Further details of the thrust of the applicants' arguments are substantially as set out in the remarks section of this paper.

The Examiner agreed that the unofficial proposed claim language defined over the cited art. The Examiner further indicated that an updated search would have to be performed. No agreements were otherwise reached between the parties.